



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SP

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,738	03/30/2004	Gabriel T. Hughes	P03843	5117
28548	7590	04/27/2005	EXAMINER	
STONEMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD			SUHOL, DMITRY	
3113 NORTH 3RD STREET			ART UNIT	
PHOENIX, AZ 85012			PAPER NUMBER	

3714

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/813,738

Applicant(s)

HUGHES, GABRIEL T.

Examiner

Dmitry Suhol

Art Unit

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase "...connecting such at least one tension force to the substantially fixed object..." appears to be incorrect in that a force is not a tangible object and therefore can not be connected to anything, however an object supplying a force may be connected to something else. Therefore the applicants should change the claim to reflect an object supplying a force being connected and not the force itself.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 13, the claim is directed to a training system (i.e. a product) but appear to list a variety of method steps, therefore it is not clear if applicants are

Art Unit: 3714

attempting to claim a method or product. For examination purposes it is assumed that the applicants are attempting to claim a method.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 6-8, 9-11, 12-20, 26, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kesler '373. Kesler discloses a dally training system containing all of the claimed elements including, providing a line means (lines 154, 158 and 314) as required by claims 1, 7, 13-14 and 26, a tension means (spring biased reel 16) as required by claims 1, 7, 14, 19-20 and 26, a line means comprising (connected to as required by claim 13) at least one dally rope (158, 314) as required by claims 1, 7, 15 and 30. A first connection means, as required by claims 2, 8 and 16, is shown as clip 160 in figure 2. A saddle horn means, as required by claims 6, 11-12 and 14 is shown in figure 1 as the saddle horn of saddle 310. At least one second connector, as required by claims 9-10 and 17-18, is inherent in the Kesler device since without such a connector reel 16 would not be able to stay in position and function as intended. The step of applying a tension force, as required by claim 13, is inherent with the reel (16) of Kesler due to the spring bias described in col. 8, lines 15-25. The step of connecting the tensioning force to a substantially fixed object, as required by claim 13, is shown in

Art Unit: 3714

figure 2 and described in col. 8, lines 15-25. The step of dallying, as required by claim 13, is described in col. 3, lines 36-51.

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rudolph '960. Rudolph discloses a dally training system containing all of the claimed elements including, at least one line (lines 10 and 18) as required by claim 14, at least one tensioner (reel 16) as required by claim 14, at least one saddle horn, as required by claim 14 is shown in figure 1 as the saddle horn 12. A first connector, as required by claim 16, is shown as clip 20 in figure 1. At least one line comprising at least one dally rope (10) as required by claim 15 is shown in figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kesler '373 in view of Fontaine '644. Kesler fails to explicitly teach a type of connection means involved in securing it to a substantially fixed object 50 as required by claims 3-4. However, Fontaine discloses a reel assembly usable with animals (like the assembly 16 of Kesler) which teaches that it is known to provide a connecting means (elements 12, 13, 14, 15, 16) in order to provide a releasable and secure connection between the

Art Unit: 3714

reel device and another object. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the applicants invention, to have provided the reel of Kesler with a connection means of Fontaine for the purpose of securely and releasably attaching the Kesler reel to another object.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kesler '373 in view of Marshall '052. Kesler fails to explicitly teach at least one clutch system to allow the user to control the tension in the at least one line as required by claim 21. However, Marshall discloses a reel assembly usable with animals (like the assembly 16 of Kesler) which teaches that it is known to provide a clutch system which allows for adjustment of desired tension produced by the spring loaded reel (clutch system of shaft 8, member 18, sleeve 13 and spring 15 described at cols. 2-3, lines 56+ and 1-16, respectively). Therefore it would have been obvious to include a clutch system with the reel device of Kesler for the purpose of allowing the user to adjust the device to the desired tension.

Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kesler '373 in view of Bacque '989. Kesler fails to explicitly teach at least one line having at least one safety release as required by claim 22, where the safety release is at least one hook and loop material as required by claim 23. However, Bacque discloses a rope (like the rope used by Kesler) which teaches that it is advantageous to provide such ropes with a safety release comprising a hook and loop material (col. 2,

Art Unit: 3714

lines 25-45). Therefore it would have been obvious to incorporate hook and loop material in-with the rope of Kesler for the purpose of providing a rope with a safety mechanism which disengages different rope portions when a predetermined tension level is reached.

Claims 22, 24-25 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kesler '373 in view of Knox '533. Kesler fails to explicitly teach at least one line having at least one safety release as required by claims 22 and 33, at least one anti-kinking element as required by claims 24 and 31, where the anti-kinking element comprises at least one swivel as required by claims 25 and 32. However, Knox discloses a rope (like the rope used by Kesler) which teaches that it is advantageous to provide such ropes with a safety release and anti-kinking element comprising a swivel (figure 11, col. 2, lines 33-38 and col. 3, lines 62+). Therefore it would have been obvious to include the structure of Knox in the rope of Kesler for the purpose of preventing twisting of the rope and allowing sections of the rope to come apart if the stress of the rope exceeds a predetermined amount.

Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kesler '373 in view of Croce et al '283. Kesler fails to teach a reel comprising eccentric portion adapted to provide irregular retraction of the line as required by claim 27, where the eccentric portion comprises at least one protrusion as required by claim 28, where at least one protrusion comprises exactly one protrusion as required by claim 29.

Art Unit: 3714

However, Croce discloses a reel assembly usable with animals (like the assembly 16 of Kesler) which teaches that it is known to provide such an assembly with an eccentric portion comprising at least one protrusion (teeth 29 and col. 4, lines 55-58) for the purpose providing more control of the reel to the user by allowing for a variety of settings including free movement, retract and lock (where it is considered that the lock settings encompasses "irregular retraction" since the line would not be continuously retracted by the reel). Therefore it would have been obvious to provide the reel of Kesler with the structure of Croce for the purpose of providing more control of the reel to the user by allowing for a variety of settings.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dmitry Suhol whose telephone number is 571-272-4430. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Friday 9am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jessica Harrison can be reached on 571-272-4449. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Dmitry Suhol
Examiner
Art Unit 3714

ds